DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 258 UD 026 803

AUTHOR Ascher, Carol
TITLE School-College Collaborations: A Strategy for Helping Low-Income Minorities. Urban Diversity Series No. 98.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 88
CONTRACT OERI-RI8806213
NOTE 46p.; For related document, see UD 026 899.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Articulation (Education); *College School Cooperation; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; Minority Groups; Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; *Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Alliances; *Collaboratives; Partnerships

ABSTRACT

Collaborations between high schools and colleges have emerged during the 1980s as a means to increase enrollments and academic success of low-income minorities in higher education although their benefits have yet to be clearly demonstrated. This review surveys the literature on the effectiveness of these collaboratives. The report is comprised of a preface (by Paula Y. Bagasao), seven sections, and a conclusion. Section 1 presents an education profile of low-income minority students. Section 2 indicates problems these students face in high school. Section 3 discusses access to four-year colleges and postsecondary remediation measures for urban minority students. Section 4 reviews the following aspects of collaboration: (1) history; (2) current practice; (3) college role; (4) public school role; and (5) funding. Section 5 examines the following types of activities targeted at students: (1) early intervention; (2) college-level study in high school; (3) academic and college counseling; (4) tutoring, mentoring, and skills building; (5) campus tours and contact with college students; (6) summer programs; (7) other college experience programs; (8) financial aid; (9) parent involvement; and (10) activities aiding students indirectly, involving teachers, curriculum, and research. Section 6 reviews the following components of collaboration: (1) leadership; (2) other participants; (3) stages of collaboration; and (4) prestige. Section 7 describes networks of school-college collaboratives. A list of 55 references is appended. (AF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308258

5.31.89

School-College Collaborations: A Strategy for Helping Low-Income Minorities

Carol Ascher

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Urban Education

UD026803

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATIONS: A STRATEGY FOR HELPING LOW-INCOME MINORITIES

Carol Ascher

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATIONS: A STRATEGY FOR HELPING LOW-INCOME MINORITIES

Carol Ascher

Urban Diversity Series No. 98

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education

December 1988

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
212/678-3433

Director: Erwin Flaxman
Assistant Director: Robin Johnson Utsey
Managing Editor: Wendy Schwartz

This publication was produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, under contract number R18806213, and from Teachers College, Columbia University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

Copies are available from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Copies are also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), 3900 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22304, 1-800-227-3742, both on microfiche and paper. Contact the Clearinghouse or EDRS for full ordering information.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks in particular Paula Y. Bagasao for her invaluable suggestions on a number of occasions both during the collection of data for this paper and during the writing of the manuscript; thanks also for her careful reading. Any mistakes or omissions herein are solely the author's.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

MINORITY STUDENTS: AN EDUCATION PROFILE 1

HIGH SCHOOL 2

HIGHER EDUCATION 3
- Four Year Colleges 3
- Remediation 4

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATIVES 5
- The History 5
- Current Practice 6
- The Colleges 7
- The Public Schools 9
- Funding 9

TYPES OF COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITIES 11
- Activities Targeted at Students 12
  - Early Intervention 13
  - College-Level Study in High School 13
  - Academic and College Counseling 14
  - Tutoring, Mentoring, and Skills Building 14
  - Campus Tours and Contact with College Students 15
  - Summer Programs 15
  - Other College Experience Programs 16
  - Financial Aid 17
  - Parent Involvement 17
  - Activities Aiding Students Indirectly 17
    - Teachers 18
    - Curriculum 21
    - Research 22

THE PROCESS OF COLLABORATION 22
- Leadership 23
- Other Participants 23
- Stages of Collaboration 25
- Prestige 26

NETWORKS OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATIVES 27

CONCLUSION 29

REFERENCES 31

Preface

Across the nation, educators from all levels of our educational system are collaborating to improve the quality of secondary schools. A particular focus, for some, is serving students at risk of failure in school. Responding to ongoing calls for equality of education, and the practical need for an expanded and better prepared working citizenry, their efforts are aimed at increasing and diversifying the number of students prepared to enter and to succeed in college, or to enter the world of work. More directly put, educators have begun, within the collaborative framework, to work together to provide equal educational opportunity to low-income and minority students.

The number of papers about school-college collaboration has grown in the last few years, and this phenomenon is reflected in this ERIC/CUE report. Considered a first on the topic is Gene Maeroff's book, *School and College: Partnerships in Education*. Six years later we have a wealth of reports to learn from, for, since 1983, there have been many more attempts at collaboration and more sophisticated analysis of the process. Nevertheless, these studies of collaboratives suggest only the beginnings of future efforts to evaluate collaboration; it is still far too soon to state definitively what works, why and how it works, and who is best served.

Several things can be said about the literature reviewed in this report. First, it covers many evaluations, written by a variety of experts; more collaborative projects are reported on; more studies analyze the process of collaboration (leadership, communication, governance, etc.); and there is a heightened focus on collaboratives that can benefit disadvantaged and minority students.

Another point to mention is that the literature discussed here reflects different viewpoints about collaboration: those of the school and those of post-secondary

institutions. From the university side, there are the views of the college president, vice president for academic affairs, dean of instruction, or the admissions officers. And then there is the perspective of the school of education. Two points about the schools of education: first, they were the first parts of university to work with secondary schools (for the purposes of teacher training), and second, their viewpoint is not often the same as that of the academic departments. In the contemporary world of school-college collaboration, there has emerged a great struggle between the school of education and the college of arts and sciences vis-a-vis work with public schools. For instance, with respect to math collaborative projects, should the math educator of the school of education be involved or the faculty members of the math department?

There are the perspectives of the school side of leadership, too: the superintendents, the curriculum specialists, etc. As this report indicates, while the school's agenda may be similar in some ways to the university's, there are also significant points of divergence. For example, the outcome of good "public relations" is a desirable one for the university president, but not necessarily of importance to the urban superintendent.

Let us not forget the viewpoints expressed by those who are involved with the classroom dimension of collaboration—the secondary and college teachers. While work with teachers indirectly serves students, there are some collaboratives that see school-college faculty collaboration as meaningful for its own sake, that is, for the professional and intellectual life of the teacher. The Academic Alliance model is one such faculty collaborative effort. Begun in 1981, it is focussed on the intellectual life of the teachers and sees teaching, at both the secondary and post-secondary levels, as one profession. It has been funded just recently by the John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and its efforts will be centered at the American Association for Higher Education in Washington, D.C. I have just assumed the directorship of this effort and will try to increase the number of alliances to about 750 nationally, representing all subjects and including minority faculty.

My recent experience with the Academic Alliance Project, and past experience as Associate Director of the College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models

Program, have provided insights into the ways that urban superintendents might most profitably approach a college or university about establishing a collaborative. First, the superintendent would need to answer a few questions before approaching the post-secondary partner. The first is, what is the superintendent hoping to do—raise test scores, improve reading, inform students about admissions procedures, reform the pre-collegiate math curriculum, etc? Depending on the response the superintendent would then approach the college president, or highest ranking officer, and meet to determine whether a "common agenda" could be reached. Proceeding is difficult, if not dangerous, without a common agenda. With this agenda in hand, who on campus should collaborate becomes clearer. If admissions issue are important, the Office of Student Affairs is key; if articulation is the focus, then the Office of Academic Affairs gets involved. An agenda involving teacher development or curriculum dictates one of two possibilities, usually not both—the discipline department or the school of education. Key, however, to all of this is that all efforts involve top leadership on both sides for the duration of the collaboration. As the literature indicates, leadership is a top priority for the possibility and success of collaboration. Top leadership also serves as a meaningful recruitment tool—it gets and keeps people involved. Leadership and other organizational aspects are fully discussed in the report.

This ERIC/CUE report provides the audience (all those interested in collaboration) with an understanding of school-college collaboration, its many meanings and many parts. It provides a variety of viewpoints about this phenomenon, and describes its possible goals, activities, and outcomes.

The work of studying and reporting/sharing about school-college collaboration is not done, however. Next on the agenda is evaluation—what works and why? Clearly, the answers to these questions are critical to our efforts to provide all students with a quality education.

The work, as well, is not finished when it comes to providing for the long life of collaboration. An unfinished question, one asked by all (including those who fund collaboration), is "how do we institutionalize these efforts?"

I hope that, when all is said and done, successes are found at the student level and that as some suspect, not alot about collaboration has to do only with the institutions themselves. This report is dedicated to what can be done for students "at risk" of failing to get a quality education and of losing the chance to make the transition from high school to college.

—Paula Y. Bagasao

Paula Y. Bagasao is Director for the Academic Alliances Project at the American Association of Higher Education. Until recently, Dr. Bagasao was the Associate Director for the College Board's EQ Model Programs.

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATIONS
A STRATEGY FOR HELPING LOW-INCOME MINORITIES

> Today, with all the talk about educational excellence, schools and colleges still live in two separate worlds. Presidents and deans rarely talk to principals and district superintendents. College faculty do not meet with their counterparts in public schools, and curriculum reforms at every level are planned in isolation. It's such a simple point—the need for close collaboration—and yet it is a priority that has been consistently ignored. Universities pretend they can have quality without working with the schools, which are, in fact, the foundation of everything universities do.
>
> —Ernest Boyer (1985, p.11)

Minority Students: An Education Profile

American education, it has been said, is divided into two distinct segments: schools and colleges. Once a year the gap between them narrows enough for students to make the move from high school to college. For students from good public or private schools, with the benefit of well-educated middle-class parents, this crossing may be fraught with anxiety, but it is generally successful. These students have the general knowledge, as well as the intellectual and social skills, to proceed with, if not flourish in, the next stage. In fact, for well-prepared, high achieving students, the first two years of college may offer many points of redundancy (Greenberg, 1987).

Students from poor, often minority, neighborhoods, however, whose parents did not themselves have a college education, and whose public schooling was inadequate, may find their preparation too meager for the precarious transition to higher education, and years of boredom and failure in public school may make the prospect of college-level work frightening or unappealing.

The difficulty that low-income minority students experience in making the transition to college is of particular concern, given the combination of economic and demographic shifts in our country (Richardson & Bender, 1987). First is the well-known prediction that, in our information-based society, young people will need increasing education to qualify for employment (Ehrenhalt, 1987). Second

are demographic changes—that is, who will comprise our future workforce. By the year 2025, minorities are expected to constitute 40 percent of all 18-24 year olds, the traditional college-age population (Mingle, 1987), and thus a significant proportion of our future workers. They will also comprise the great majority of students in urban schools serving areas undergoing particular economic growth (Lund, 1988). That these youth need to be educated to meet the demands on the workforce they will join is unquestioned.

High School

Despite our nation's long lip-service to "equal educational opportunity," from the earliest grades poor minority students tend to be placed in schools and classrooms with less experienced teachers, fewer supplies, and a lower quality of curriculum—all of which place them at risk for school completion and entrance into college (Keating & Oakes, 1988).

While some minority youth, particularly those from middle-class families, will make the transition from high school to college, for many more, the step will be too great—or not of interest. At the most obvious level, students from schools in low-income minority neighborhoods often graduate without the skills, grades, course requirements, or test results required for college admission. While about half of all high school seniors go on to college full-time the semester after graduation, the percentage for minorities is much lower (Mingle, 1987). In 1983 in California, to cite a state with a rapidly growing minority population, among public high school graduates only 3.6 percent of blacks and 4.9 percent of Hispanics were even eligible for admission to the University of California based on grades and course requirements; further, among this small eligible minority group, 61 percent of the blacks and 57 percent of the Hispanics did not take the standardized tests required for admission to the University of California or other selective colleges and universities, reducing the admissible minority students to 1.4 percent of black public high school graduates and 2.1 percent of Hispanic public high school graduates (University of California, 1987).

The problem of improving students' preparation for college has led to general school improvement efforts—which, unfortunately, also fail to serve the needs of the poorly prepared student. It is inadequate simply to bring an eleventh grader to

a college for a special campus visit, or to provide the new freshman with a mentor, special minority counseling, or some tutoring. While these small aids are all valuable, the students must also be given the relevant academic prerequisites for college, starting early and continuing throughout their public school years. This means that high quality, pre-college curricula and notable teaching talent must be distributed equitably to all students, *including* to those in poor urban neighborhoods. Students in low-income, predominantly minority school districts must also be encouraged to enroll in the prerequisite courses for college entrance and, when necessary, to take the required college entrance exams.

Higher Education

Unfortunately, the problem is hardly solved once blacks and other minorities get into "a college." Access patterns show that minority students are overrepresented in schools characterized by retention problems: two year colleges, public institutions, and less selective programs. While minorities constitute 14.5 percent of all students in four-year colleges, they predominate in two-year colleges, particularly those situated in urban areas where 60-95 percent of the entering students need remediation, a large majority do not attend full-time, and more than half drop out before graduation (Richardson & Bender, 1987). The fact that many minority students are from low-income families, require financial aid, are older, or have jobs and family responsibilities, means that they are also more vulnerable to non-academic pressures to withdraw (Preer, 1981). As the authors of a major study on minority access and achievement in higher education note, "the policy decision made by many states in the 1960s to rely on community colleges as the primary access point for urban minorities has produced side effects that now threaten some of the hoped-for outcomes" (Richardson & Bender, 1987, p.1). In fact, the *ipso facto* ghettoized and terminal Associate Arts (A.A.) or Associate Science (A.S.) degree may increasingly appear as merely an extended high school degree.

Four Year Colleges

In urban areas, where four-year institutions share a disproportionate responsibility for educating blacks and Hispanics, the tendency has been for them to lower standards and create more limited program offerings—to become quite different in quality and scope from other higher education institutions. Thus,

together with the predominantly minority community colleges, these urban four-year colleges form a separate educational system that treats minority and low-income students differently, "perpetuating separation and inequality" (Orfield, et al., cited in Richardson & Bender, 1987, p. 5). It is necessary, however, for four-year colleges to do more than merely accept survivors of the two-year institutions. Nonetheless, although some schools of education have tried to respond to changing urban populations with new curricula and teacher education programs, until the recent attempts to forge school-university alliances, even in urban areas colleges and universities generally made few institutional efforts to cultivate open communication and working relationships with their local public school systems (see discussion below). "[T]he gap continued to widen between university entrance criteria and the skills of secondary school students" (Mocker, Martin & Brown, 1988, p. 42).

Remediation

Remedial courses have proliferated in the two-year colleges, as well as in public and open admissions four-year colleges—where they do not have a very high rate of success. By 1983-84, a national survey showed that 94 percent of all public colleges and 70 percent of all private colleges offered at least one remedial course in reading, writing, or mathematics. But the major burden of remediation was assumed by public, two-year, and open admissions colleges. Calculated in terms of students, 27 percent of all freshmen in public colleges and 15 percent of all freshmen in private colleges took at least one remedial course—and 8-10 percent more students nationally needed remedial courses than were taking them (Calahan & Farris, 1986).

Further, offering such courses does not necessarily mean that students will bring their knowledge and skills up to the required level by the end of freshman year. Among those entering Essex Community College in New Jersey in 1983, for example, more than 83 percent required remediation, and 74 percent of those who needed it failed to complete the course (Richardson & Bender, 1987). Similarly, at Eastern Washington University, where 80 percent of the 1981 freshmen were assigned to a remedial math class, less than half were able to demonstrate adequate proficiency in basic math, algebra, and/or geometry by the end of their

freshman year (Kenny & Carlson, 1982). Not surprisingly, a national survey confirms the fact that students taking remediation courses are somewhat less likely to remain in school beyond their freshman year than are students not taking such courses (Calahan & Farris, 1986).

School-College Collaboratives

The History

Collaboratives in which schools join with other educational and cultural institutions, and businesses, have become among the more popular solutions to a variety of educational problems in the 1980s. Although school-college collaboratives play a relatively minor role among these collaborations—one estimate is a mere ten percent (Albert, 1988)—they have become one of the main reform measures directed at improving the school-college transition. For example, the College Board's EQ Models Program for School-College Collaboration (discussed below) is based on the belief that, "cooperation between secondary and post secondary education can increase the number and diversity of students who succeed in college" (The College Board, 1987).

Like other collaboratives, the proliferation of school-university collaboratives is extremely recent. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee study of urban school-university collaboratives, the most comprehensive analysis of its kind thus far, found about 80 percent of the collaboratives in its survey were started after 1980, and over a third were begun after 1984 (Mickelson, Kritek, Hedlund, & Kaufman, 1988). Unfortunately, these rapidly proliferating school-college collaboratives have received more attention than serious study—partly because they are extremely hard to evaluate (Mickelson, et al., 1988).

School-college articulation efforts are not all new, however. Advanced Placement (AP) Programs, in which high school students earn college credit or are placed in college courses on the basis of completed high school courses, have existed for some time, as have dual enrollment programs, in which high school students take regular college courses for credit outside of their normal high school credit. A recent study of community and junior colleges revealed that most of them participate in some kind of collaboration with local high schools, (Parnell, 1985). Not surprisingly, however, there are few minorities in these programs.

There is also a long history of schools drawing on university expertise, and universities—particularly schools of education—using schools as research and teacher training laboratories. Schools and universities have at times shared facilities. And schools and universities have often communicated, either through formalized programs, or through informal meetings between superintendents and college presidents (Van Patten & Dennison, 1987). In fact, as the University of Wisconsin study makes clear, most of the collaboratives of the 1980s are based on relationships begun long before that (Mickelson, et al., 1988).

What is important is that, until this recent period, these collaboratives were generally considered to be fraught with difficulty and unlikely to succeed. While school personnel tended to have poor images of themselves and to look upon advice from the outside with suspicion, college personnel thought rather well of themselves and tended to expect their relationships with school people to be one between superiors and inferiors. While school personnel felt a constant urgency, regarding the clock and the calendar as tyrants, college personnel believed there should always be time for thinking, reading, and meeting. Thus, these collaboratives were "instances of 'two cultures' interacting—that is, two cultures misunderstanding and clashing with each other" (Sarasan, 1985).

Current Practice

The literature on the new school-college collaboratives often distinguishes between these collaborations and other joint activities, such as cooperatives, coalitions, partnerships, and alliances (Hord, 1986; P.Y. Bagasao, personal communication, 1988; Vivian, 1986). Though such distinctions may be useful to administrators attempting to clarify institutional relations or the collegial process, in this paper, collaboratives are used generically. Here, collaboratives describe a variety of ties among the members of two or more institutions—including some connection between individuals at top levels. Although the various institutions or individuals may not have exactly the same goals for their connection, the collaborations arise out of the understanding that both institutions are "struggling with related aspects of common problems" in order to solve them (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988, p. vii). In doing this, both organizations are changed and improved (Martin, et al., 1986).

As distinguished from their pre-1980s predecessors, the current school-college collaborations also emphasize collegiality and equality among the collaborative members, although the equality is probably still more an ideal to strive for than a reality (see discussion below). The common assumption is that such questions as school-college articulation, teacher education, in-service training, and special programs for minorities and at-risk youth can best be addressed when members of the collaborative regard one another equally with a common mission (Wilbur, Lambert, & Young, 1987).

The programs of many of these new collaboratives cover a broader area than simply the school-to-college transition. Nevertheless, even those that do not directly treat the school-college transition have several stated school improvement goals that impinge on it:

- generating new curricula that meet some of the school reform agendas;
- enhancing instruction for all students, particularly those at risk;
- providing new and better ways of recruiting teachers and strengthening teaching; and
- improving the articulation between k-12 and post-secondary education.

Several school-college collaborations, such as the Louis Armstrong Middle School in Queens, New York, and the Boston Compact began in response to desegregation litigation (Trubowitz, 1984; Farrar, 1988), and so, as part of a general concern with equity, strongly emphasize minority dropout prevention and improvement of minority access to higher education. Research is also an obvious component of collaboratives, and several school-university collaborations are replacing the traditional one-way direction of educational research with more truly collaborative research.

The Colleges

Collaborations meet several needs of the participating colleges. Most generally, colleges have realized that by joining their resources with those of the public schools their own educational programs can be enhanced. They hope to

avoid expenditures for remediation and developmental courses by focusing on improving primary and secondary schooling—and even preschool education. They hope that public school curriculum and instruction can be improved so that it will better "articulate" with the skills and knowledge needed at the post-secondary level. The "Education Connections Project," for example, exists in seven demonstration center schools around the country, as well as eight "consulting" schools which already have exemplary articulation activities. Each center joins a school district with one or two participating colleges to work for improved articulation in specific subject areas (Wilbur, et al., 1987, p. 66).

In a period of declining enrollments, colleges and universities are in the market for students, and partnerships or collaborations are one means of bidding for the interested and prepared students in the schools with which they work. Since 1983, Project STEP has linked the Santa Ana Unified School District with four types of California post-secondary institutions: the California State University at Fullerton, Chapman College, Rancho Santiago Community College, and the University of California at Irvine. STEP includes a number of components, including courses for teachers and students, student tutoring, a curriculum review, workshops for counselors, and a summer bridge program to introduce students and their parents to higher education staff (The College Board, 1987).

Schools of education have also found that they can profit from the in-service education courses that collaboratives provide, and collaborations with public schools answer the common criticism that colleges are "out of touch," at the same time as they offer opportunities to test research in the field. On the other hand, a consensus has been a growing that the responsibility for education should be expanded beyond the schools of education, to the universities as a whole (Mocker, et al., 1988). Colleges administrators, both in- and outside of schools of education, often feel pressure from political leaders to show their community spirit by joining collaborations that are directed to solving urban school needs. Perhaps out of the same impulse, colleges often list increasing minority enrollment as a major reason for forming collaboratives (Mickelson, et al., 1988). Also, as Trubowitz (1984) suggests, many grants available to institutions of higher education currently prescribe that the college must work with a public school.

One final impetus for collaborating that ranks high with universities is improving relationships with the communities. While other outcomes of collaboratives benefit colleges and schools alike, as Mickelson et al. (1988) point out, the public relations value that accrues to universities from joining collaboratives does not work the same way for public schools. "When a university uses its expertise and resources to help urban schools, it is meeting community expectations and university presidents seem to understand this dimension instinctively. When a school utilizes university expertise, however, this may indicate weakness and superintendents seem to understand this possibility" (p. 56). The issue of differential prestige is discussed again below, since the traditional assumption that universities can only give, while schools can only take, has been one of the banes to both sides of these collaborations.

The Public Schools

School-college collaborations offer the public schools several advantages. Like universities, public schools report that increasing minority enrollment in college is an important reason for forming collaboratives (Mickelson, et al., 1988). Through these collaboratives they can create programs that focus sharply on issues of curriculum articulation and student motivation. One of the first projects of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Public Schools collaborative, for instance, was the distribution of a brochure to students in grades 7-12 outlining recommended secondary courses by field of study (Larkin, 1987). Collaboratives also offer schools the opportunity to work directly on their concerns about teacher preparation. And they can enhance school facilities, providing new science and language laboratories; offer opportunities to work outside the school bureaucracy; and create a wider community of resources and support for school improvement (Gross, 1988). In districts suffering from white middle-class flight, collaborations with a prestigious college or university may stem, or even reverse, the flow of these children out of the public schools (Trubowitz, 1984).

Funding

As with all extraordinary programming, funding has been both the miracle and the bane of school-university collaborations. Although fund raising for collaboratives has had a measure of success, financial support is typically on three-year cycles, after which the programs either find new money, become

institutionalized, or die out. Equally problematic, funding often comes with requirements and obligations that can change the priorities of the project.

For foundations, funding school-college collaboratives is often part of a larger agenda, including the health of an important urban community. Foundations generally support educational programs on the grounds that doing so is good public relations, that it helps prepare future employees, and that it reduces welfare and unemployment, as well as the costs of other forms of social disrepair. Of the various possible investments in education, foundations appear to favor school-university collaborations currently, because they obviate the need to distribute small amounts to competing schools or school districts, and they create support for a more unified educational and social agenda, including the possibility of influencing legislation.

Interestingly, over a quarter of the university and school respondents in the University of Wisconsin study were influenced in their decision to form a collaborative by the opportunity to get outside funding. Nevertheless, in dollars, private funding appears to be less supportive of school-college collaboratives than either the states or the schools and universities themselves (Mickelson, et al., 1988). Although foundations are concerned about institutionalization, until now foundation support has been project-based, which means that there is no sustained support for evolving and long-term collaborations.

Such sustained support is critical, given one of the more ambitious goals for collaboratives. As Goodlad has argued, school-university collaborations offer one genuine possibility for significant educational change. Since schools and universities have distinctly different cultures, both of which are characteristically rigid, and since "fundamental change tends to be the result of different cultures impinging on one another," Goodlad sees these collaborations as providing an opportunity for institutional renewal of both schools and universities (1988, p. 13). "Just as the culture of the individual school can powerfully resist changes imposed upon it, the same culture can be a potent force of change, given proper conditions" (p. 17).

Types of Collaborative Activities

Collaboratives tend to have such a positive connotation that the inclination of participating schools and college may be to create one and then decide just how to use it. Nevertheless, when the collaborative is ultimately designed, it can usually be characterized by target group, by activities, and by goals.

The *target group* for most collaborative activities is students, but a number of projects are also directed at public school teachers, curriculum specialists, secondary school administrators, parents, and the larger community.

The number of *activities* already created by school-college collaboratives is enormous, and new ones are still being developed. Activities can be divided into those which directly target students and those which indirectly improve students' educational experiences, as the sample list below demonstrates:

Student Targeted Activities	Activities Indirectly Related To Students' Learning
college study in high school	teacher professional
admissions counseling	development and renewal
academic counseling	curriculum development and delivery
financial aid	district policy changes
tutoring/mentoring	parent involvement
information dissemination	research

The specific *goals* of school-university collaboratives vary nearly as much as the activities do, although the general aim is usually to improve student academic achievement. For example, some programs provide minorities in high school with college access, while others try to ensure the success of minority students who are already enrolled in college (P.Y. Bagasao, personal communication, 1988). The goal of some programs is improving the academic achievement or motivation of a targeted group of low-income minority students, while for others it is general school improvement—or even greater job satisfaction for the professional staff.

For example, the goal of Upward Bound programs, one of the pre-1980s school-university collaborations, is to increase the college enrollment of students who, because of poverty, are not prepared for college entrance. By contrast, teachers' institutes, workshops, and other professional development activities are aimed at teachers' personal renewal and intellectual growth, which can be translated into practices or attitudes that encourage student achievement.

Activities Targeted at Students

An enormous number of collaborative programs around the country have been created to improve students' preparation for college and provide college outreach to students. Most important are the strategies to improve college readiness. These include policies, often instituted at the state level, that mandate *courses* to be completed prior to admissions by public universities, or at least recommend a course of study to all college-bound students, and/or that mandate *competencies* for college-bound students to acquire; and widely publicized statements announcing raised expectations for students. As a result of these strategies, high schools promote academic courses to better prepare students for college, and justify their added expenses on the basis that colleges will not enroll ill-prepared high school graduates (Brizius & Cooper, 1984).

At a local level, specific programs must be instituted to ensure that raised standards do not lead to more failure and even fewer college admissions among low-income minorities. Obviously, the best way to eliminate poor preparation is to intervene early—even at the preschool level—with better curriculum and teaching. Most of the collaborative programs, however, focus on junior and senior high school. Some are aimed at gifted and talented students; others (not necessarily in contradistinction) target those who are minority, disadvantaged, or "at-risk" for school failure and/or dropping out. When students experiencing difficulty in staying in school or making the transition to college (whatever their natural gifts) are targeted, the programs focus on early intervention. They include college level study in high school, academic and college counseling, tutoring and skills building, campus tours, summer programs and other college experience programs, financial aid, and parent involvement—often combining several strategies at once. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (Halcon, 1988), for example, has recently published short descriptions of 18 "exemplary programs" for minority

students who are college bound. Although, for illustration, I briefly describe programs below under each of the strategies, most could be placed with equal validity under another strategy, or under several simultaneously.

Early Intervention. The best antidote to poor preparation is to give students the help they need to succeed when they first start to lag behind. An example of such early intervention is a collaboration between Ohio State University and Westland High School, near Columbus, in the area of mathematics. Since 1977, Westland has administered to college-bound juniors the math placement test that Ohio State Universities gives to freshman during summer orientation. The result has been a substantial increase in the number of seniors taking mathematics courses and a decrease in the need for college remediation the following year (Brizius & Cooper, 1984).

College-Level Study in High School. A number of programs for low-achievers, dropouts, or other at-risk youth around the country have used the strategy of offering college-level courses while the students are still in high school. While advanced placement into college, and offering college-level courses in the high school, are well-tried strategies for gifted students, a more recent approach has been to create early or middle college programs, often situated on college campuses, that combine the later secondary school years with the early college years to create a new, time-shortened, continuum.

For example, the Middle School at La Guardia Community College is a collaborative program between La Guardia and the New York City Public Schools for at-risk students with college potential. Developed to solve some of the problems that the City University of New York faced with unprepared students, the Middle School, situated on the college campus, attempts to create a "seamless web." The Middle School features flexible pacing, broad curricular options, service-oriented career education, and a required internship for all students (J.E. Lieberman, 1985). After the tenth grade, students can take college courses if they meet eligibility requirements. Although 78 percent of the student body is on public assistance, in the 11 years since the Middle College's inception, 500 students, or nearly a third of the Middle College's enrollees, have taken and completed college courses. Moreover, the Middle College has a dropout rate of

14.5 percent compared to a 46 percent city-wide average (J.E. Lieberman, 1985). The college environment, the small classes, the job component, as well as the incentive of college-level courses, all provide a strong motivation for students to stay in school. The idea of a Middle College is currently being replicated on seven additional campuses (P.Y. Bagasao, personal communication, 1988).

Academic and College Counseling. As a state with high and growing minority populations, particularly Hispanic, California has made a concerted effort to increase minority participation in college. The University of California system sponsors both an Early Outreach Program and an Immediate Outreach Program in schools throughout the state. Initiated in 1976, the Early Outreach Program allows University representatives to advise and encourage students to take the proper courses even before they enter high school. The program offers several types of student-directed services. At the junior high school level, the program identifies promising minority and low-income students and motivates them to attend a post-secondary educational institution. These students continue to receive services at the senior high school level (other students in the targeted schools can also participate), when the program becomes more comprehensive, including academic advising, tutoring, campus visits, and summer programs.

The Immediate Outreach Program operates in most of the schools of the State, including private and parochial schools. It provides such services as presentations to high school and community college students and counselors; parent conferences; campus tours; career information days; admission programs; and University freshman orientation sessions and seminars (University of California, 1987).

Tutoring, Mentoring, and Skills Building. Two-day January workshops and six-week summer sessions with a curriculum directed to thinking and problem solving form the core of CHAMP (Creating Higher Aspirations and Motivations Program) at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside. The program is a collaborative with the Racine and Kinosha United School Districts, and aims to serve ninth through twelfth grade minority youth. In addition to its intellectual component, the program also orients students to the nature of post-secondary education, helps them recognize the connection between high school and college courses, and encourages them to enroll in upper-level courses. One aspect of the program's success has

been the wide involvement and support of minority community leaders, especially in churches and service organizations (Wilbur, et al., 1987, p. 41).

The Kenmore Tutoring Project in Akron, Ohio, shows that a school-university collaborative can be run by two individuals. The Project was initiated in 1984 by the principal of Kenmore High School and an associate professor of English education at the University of Akron. University of Akron students in a course on "Instructional Techniques in English" meet at Kenmore High School once a week; there they observe English teachers, tutor students, evaluate writing, and confer one-on-one with high school students about their papers. The high school also has a writing lab, staffed by University of Akron students (Wilbur, et al., 1987, p. 89).

The City University of New York/ Board of Education Mentoring program links high school students at risk for dropping out with high-achieving college students who intend to major in education. The college students are trained to become mentors and may receive course credit for their work (City University of New York, 1985).

Campus Tours and Contact with College Students. The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences of the University of Southern California (USC) and 120 Catholic elementary (k-8) and high schools, as well as public junior and senior high schools in the Los Angeles area, have directed a collaborative project aimed specifically at Hispanic students. These students are encouraged to attend college through: 1) oral presentations by full-time USC undergraduate Hispanic students on the advantages of going to college, preparing for college, financing the college years, and what college is like; 2) a campus visit to introduce Hispanic juniors and seniors to academic programs, support services, admissions procedures, and financial aid options; and 3) periodic mailings to the "Registry of Future Hispanic College Students" (those who attended the oral presentation and/or visited the campus) to keep up their motivation (Wilbur, et al., 1987).

Summer Programs. The Med Core Program, jointly sponsored by the Southern California School of Medicine and the Los Angeles School Unified District, serves predominantly minority students. During the summer months, junior and senior high school students take Introduction to Basic Medicine,

Introduction to Basic Science, and Introduction to Laboratory Research, and an SAT Improvement class. The program also includes a Saturday tutorial program during the school year, although some students drop out because of needing to work. An evaluation of the program showed that 94 percent of the June '81 Med Core graduates were enrolled in colleges (compared to 56 percent of all other graduates). Moreover, 71 percent of the '81 Med Core graduates were pursuing health careers (Wright, 1982).

Smaller in scale is a program in Detroit, in which four high schools send students to the University of Michigan to spend summers working as research assistants to professors in the physical, biological, and social sciences. (Some students spend weekends there during the school year as well.) The students live on campus and work a full day in the labs; often the research is graduate-level work. The focus is on showing students what hard work and discipline are like, as well as on giving them the confidence that they can be scholars. The program also contains a high school teacher component (Brown, 1983).

A collaborative program in Stillwater, Oklahoma, brings predominantly minority students from the public schools onto the Oklahoma State University campus for a week of discussions and tours which illustrate "the nature of college life and the skills necessary for academic and professional success" (B. Graalman, personal communication, 1988). An interesting component of the Summer Enrichment Program is the use of the minority graduates, now in college, as dorm counselors to the high school students while they live on campus (Carroll, 1987).

Other College Experience Programs. The idea of giving high school students college experience before they actually enter college is widespread, and school districts often create programs outside of specific summer school experiences. For example, an alliance between Midwood High School in Brooklyn, New York, and nearby Brooklyn College resulted in several programs that brought high school students to the college campus. As a result of planning meetings between the high school department heads and the college department chairs, Midwood students are able to use Brooklyn College's library and laboratory space, and attend college classes and theatre department rehearsals. Moreover, a College Experience Program was initiated, through which juniors with at least

grade-level reading skills received some college lectures, and seniors took courses at Brooklyn College (P. Crossier, personal communication, 1988).

Financial Aid. Thus far, of all the projects, financial aid programs are least likely to be collaborative activities. Nevertheless, in a period when students find it difficult to get financial assistance and often must rely on employment and loans, these projects are extremely important. Low income minorities, particularly, often need the incentive of financial aid in order to complete their education.

Parent Involvement. A program initiated in 1984 at Arizona State University in cooperation with the Phoenix Elementary School district focuses on eighth grade girls and their mothers, and includes a support network that remains in place throughout the girls' high school experience. The goal is to intervene early in the educational development of these young women—before they make choices which limit their educational options. Among those who have reached their junior and senior years of high school, 83 percent are still enrolled in school (Halcon, 1988).

Activities Aiding Students Indirectly. The disadvantage of collaborative programs directed solely at small groups of poor or minority students is that many low-income minorities are of necessity left out. Moreover, these student-directed programs may leave the system of education untouched. This is why a number of collaboratives have chosen instead to focus on creating system-wide change, even though their efforts appear to improve the education of students only indirectly. Collaborative programs whose goal is to improve teaching is one such example. Other projects, such as project STEP in California, are extremely ambitious and try to help specific students at the same time as they work to effect system-wide change.

Most school-university collaborative programming that is not directed at students involves either professional development, curriculum improvement, and/or research. While many of these indirect services may lead to general school improvement, or even to better overall educational services aimed at a specific target population, the connection between them and improved student motivation, achievement, or college access is difficult to evaluate and only rarely shown. In

fact, teachers, for instance, often resist having their professional development activities evaluated by measures student success.

Teachers. It has often been said that an important, if not the crucial, locus of educational change is teachers. A number of reports of the 1980s have summarized the critical changes needed in how teachers teach and are rewarded for their efforts: providing substantial salary increases, lessening their isolation, and generally empowering them are the most often mentioned. It was also made clear that agencies outside the public schools can work around bureaucratic obstacles, provide teachers with much needed "plaudits and recognition" and serve as leverages for change (Maeroff, 1988).

Although in its 1983 report on secondary education, the Carnegie Foundation found "disappointingly few" examples of school-university partnerships directed to helping teachers (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983), both the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations have supported major teacher collaboratives that include outside institutions. One of the most important of these collaboratives nationally is the Yale-New Haven Teacher Training Institute (Maeroff, 1988; Vivian 1985a, 1985b). There is also one type of collaborative that is thriving and needs relatively little formal institutionalization, the Academic Alliances (see below).

School-college collaborations for teacher education and renewal are one obvious means of initiating public school reform. Not only can colleges bring the leverage of an outside agency, but school-college collaborations are a natural means of closing the gap between those who study schools and teach educators and those who work inside schools (Sinclair & Ghory, 1987).

Obviously, the use of universities for teacher development is not new; in fact, teachers have been educated in colleges and universities and attend their local colleges and schools of education for in-service training and other professional development for many years. However, literature on the new school-university collaboratives argues that there is a great difference between the professional development that goes on here and development in the traditional programs (Maeroff, 1988; Vivian, 1985a, 1985b). Recent collaboratives aim to break the

university dominance over public education and allow college and public school faculty to learn from each other. As Vivian (1985a, p. xvi) writes of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, "By assigning greater prestige and power to school teaching and by engaging teachers in study and writing about their disciplines, the Teachers Institute implicitly questions whether teaching in school and teaching in college should be regarded as so very different."

Over the last several years, school-university collaboratives have sponsored a variety of in-service activities for teachers. These include dialogues, summer institutes, and sustained activities focusing on a particular theme over a period of time (Adelman, 1988). While some programs, such as the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, are highly institutionalized, with significant funding (the Institute is even creating an endowment), others are much smaller and more fragile, and still others are informal and involve individuals, rather than institutions.

Three examples of teacher-directed school-university collaborations will make some of the options concrete:

Started in 1978, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has involved 80 New Haven seventh to twelfth grade school teachers in a four-and-a-half month program of talks, workshops, and seminars each year. As Fellows of the Institute, New Haven public school teachers are paid a $650 stipend to work with Yale professors in studying topics they themselves have helped select, and in preparing new curriculum materials that they and other teachers will use in the coming year. The programs of the Institute thus are "teacher-driven" and the goals stress the importance of teacher-developed materials. While at the Institute, teachers are listed in the Yale directory and enjoy privileges in the libraries and other facilities.

One much advertised aspect of the Institute is that the teachers remain the specialists in pedagogy. Because Yale has no school of education, Yale professors act only as specialists in subject areas. The focus on subject matter in the seminars is important in improving the knowledge of teachers who are often not teaching in subjects in which they majored in college or graduate school. And the division of labor contributes to the sense of autonomy and professionalism teachers experience in the Institute. However, in a city where 60 percent of the secondary

students come from families receiving public assistance, and 83 percent are black or Hispanic (Vivian, 1985b), the fact that the seminars themselves focus on subject matter, to the exclusion of developing new and creative pedagogy, might also be seen as a handicap.

Nevertheless, J.R. Vivian, the Institute's Director, reports that the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has significantly increased teachers' knowledge of their disciplines, raised their morale, and heightened their expectations of their students' ability to learn. This in turn will improve student learning (Vivian, 1985b). Also critical, in a poll of New Haven teachers who had been fellows at the Institute, almost half reported that participating in the program had been "an important factor in their deciding to remain a public school teacher in New Haven" (Maeroff, 1983, p. 37).

An interesting but smaller program has been initiated in Lubbock, Texas, where there is a tremendous disparity between the percentage of blacks and Hispanics in the public schools and the percentage in the university. There, a collaboration between Texas Tech University and the Lubbock Independent School District matches university and public school faculty. Professors serve as general resources for the class, exchange places with the teachers during the year for some classes, serve as role models and mentors to students considering a major or career in their field, and recruit students to Texas Tech (Ishler & Leslie, 1987). While neither public school nor college teachers receive instruction in this program, the collaborative does seem to offer an equitable situation for both parties.

Finally, the Academic Alliances, which are modeled on the concept of the county medical society or bar association, consist of local groups of public school and college faculty in particular subject areas throughout the country, and are probably among the most egalitarian of the school-university collaborations. The Academic Alliances involve neither public schools nor institutions of higher education. Instead, college and public school teachers, acting as individuals, hold monthly meetings in which they meet as equals, "find common ground and learn from and teach each other" (Gaudiani & Burnett, 1985/86, p.11). Although most groups have a 3- or 4-1 ratio of public school to college teachers, this may in part be a reflection of the preponderance of public school teachers in most areas (L.

Albert, personal communication, 1988). While some Academic Alliance groups have a simple subject focus, others deal with more specific issues, like the Greater Boston Foreign Language Collaborative, which is considering how to teach foreign languages to minority youth, and, particularly, how to ease the high school-to-college curricular transition (The College Board, 1987).

Curriculum. As experience from the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute suggests, revitalizing teachers and improving the curriculum often go hand-in-hand. Similarly, as in the SUPER projects discussed immediately below, curriculum development can be accompanied by research projects to devise alternative teaching methods that enhance learning, and to re-energize and retrain teachers participating in the research.

The School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal (SUPER) is a many-faceted collaborative program between the University of California, Berkeley Graduate School of Education, and four local school districts. A major goal of SUPER is to build a self-evaluating community of practice-sensitive researchers who work in tandem with research-sensitive teachers. Among SUPER's numerous activities is the SUPER-El Cerrito Ninth Grade Research project, which focuses on minority at-risk students. Initiated when a group of secondary school teachers invited a university professor to work with them on her research concerning expectations and their academic consequences, the SUPER-El Cerrito project has evolved into a sustained cooperative project in which teachers and researchers together develop a curriculum to improve student academic self-confidence and performance. Similarly, teachers and researchers work together to collect data on the curriculum's changing impact (Sosniak, 1989; SUPER, 1988).

Some curriculum-oriented collaborations focus more on delivery than on development. The Oklahoma Consortium for Excellence in Education, for example, is a partnership between the College of Arts and Sciences at Oklahoma State University and public secondary schools throughout the state. Initially focused on communicating the university's expectations for students entering college, and on supporting public school efforts to teach to these expectations, the Consortium has begun providing live interactive teleconferenced courses via satellite in German, physics, calculus, and trigonometry to small rural secondary

schools which until then could not afford to offer such courses. The "Satellite German"—or physics, or calculus—is taught by Oklahoma State University professors who get time off to write and teach the courses; at the same time, local public school teachers and principals take on the responsibility of working with the students receiving the satellite instruction, and so themselves become more knowledgeable in the subject (Sosniak & Goodlad, 1989).

Research. Just as the UC Berkeley's SUPER program is a new model for curriculum development, it is also a model for a new way to conduct research. The various research projects conducted by professors in the Graduate School of Education through SUPER must all be formulated, planned, and run jointly with the collaborating schools. Though both researchers and teachers have at different times been irritated by each others' priorities, and the research has certainly gone in different directions and at different paces from the way it might have on its own, both sides appear to have been nourished by the collaboration.

It should be noted that, while SUPER is probably the most publicized of the collaborative research projects, the model has been used in a number of other places, also with apparent success (Lieberman, 1986). This may be because, as Gifford (1986, p. 80) remarks, "conditions within the school of education and those in the public schools were affected by the same two states that marked the whole profession: fragmentation and isolation," and thus "rejoining the fragments" has been an important revitalizing step. Or it may be because, as Goodlad (1988, p. 21) notes, "The juxtaposition of the action-oriented culture of the school and the inquiry-oriented culture of the university offers promise of shaking loose the calcified programs of both."

The Process of Collaboration

Two typical questions asked about collaboratives are: How do they work? (also expressed as, what makes them successful?), and, do we know if they have any measurable effect on schooling? The first question asks about those qualities that allow a collaborative to function smoothly and endure over time; the latter looks for the effects of collaborative designs and projects on the teachers, students, or other groups at whom they're aimed. Unfortunately, there is scant and uneven reporting of project results in the literature. In fact, we do not know whether the

egalitarian relationships sought in the current collaboratives are more effective than were the traditional hierarchical relationships in improving teaching, developing curriculum, or doing research.

Because most of the existing programs are new, and because collaboratives are often difficult and unwieldy entities to manage, there has been incomparably more material over the past years on process than on impact. Indeed, there appears to be a tendency in the literature—perhaps common to new endeavors—to lose sight of the goals of the collaborative altogether and simply to concentrate on the ways in which collaboratives can be kept alive.

Leadership

The wealth of descriptive materials on school-university collaborations all agrees on one point: for a collaboration to be successful, top leadership in both institutions must be involved (Trubowitz, 1984; Mocker, et al., 1988). This means the district superintendent on the public school side, and the president, vice president of academic affairs, dean of admissions, or dean of education on the college side. These individuals give legitimacy to the enterprise, and ensure that human and financial resources are available as the project moves ahead.

Other Participants

Once top leadership is committed, it is important to draw on the efforts of those who would naturally be interested in the project, and who have the most to gain by participating. This usually includes a principal, an assistant superintendent, a community leader, and faculty (teachers and professors), counselors, and other staff of both institutions. The goals of the project should be clearly expressed, as should the benefits that will accrue to the participating individuals.

Collaborations will also need to involve specific schools or departments within each institution. For example, if a public school or public school system is initiating the alliance, it can begin by connecting with one of a number of areas within a university, the choice depending on the desired project. A program focused on student outreach and support, or on parent and community involvement, will most likely be done in cooperation with the university's admissions department; a program focused on building teacher capacity or strengthening

curricular congruence might be done through the department of academic affairs or a relevant academic department, or in connection with a department of education.

Mocker et al. (1988) point out that collaborations are most effective when a broad range of schools and departments within a university are involved. However, because of the history of tension between, say, mathematicians and mathematics educators, the most difficult alliances will be those that involve both the mathematics and the mathematics education departments (P.Y. Bagasao, personal communication, 1988). Nonetheless, some college presidents mandate campus-wide support for a collaboration (Mocker, et al., 1988). And there are a few instances in which the same school system works simultaneously, and successfully, with several parts of a university campus. The University of California at Berkeley, for instance, has developed collaborative programs through its Graduate School of Education, its Mathematics Department, and the central administration.

Whatever the institutional bases for collaborating, for faculty in colleges and universities, collaborating with a public school can be a mixed experience. As Gaudiani and Burnett argue, college and public school faculty may no longer have widely divergent work lives. "Far from living in an ivory tower, today's college professors rarely publish. (Fewer than 40 percent have published anything in the last two years.) Most worry, instead, about teaching an ever more heterogeneous group of students, perhaps in the evening, the summer, and on or off the campus" (Gaudiani & Burnett, 1985/86, p. 4). On the one hand, there is the chance to escape the trap of isolation and to help create a new generation of better prepared college students through a collaborative. Working with public school professionals may also give college and university faculty a sense of comparative prestige. On the other hand, the reward structure for college professors is still based predominantly on teaching and publishing. When research proceeds more slowly because of collaborative activities, publications are clearly slowed down. Although many universities now give lip service to the importance of "community service," few colleges or universities have built such participation into their reward structure. Thus, most faculty members who throw themselves into school-college collaborations are still likely to be left behind in their move up the career ladder (Gifford, 1986).

Stages of Collaboration

Trubowitz's seven stages in the development of a school-university collaboration drawn from experience with the Louis Armstrong Middle School-Queens College collaboration (Trubowitz, 1986), have been replicated by other collaboratives many times since. Further, Gifford and Gabelko (1987) offer a similar progression of the psychological shifts that collaborative members undergo. For Trubowitz, the first stage, hostility and skepticism, takes its name from the public school's reaction to college people in their midst.

> School people are weary of experiences in which a big-name university expert arrives on the scene, gives "solutions" to problems, and then quickly moves away. They are wary of college professors who enter the public school world to do their experiments and then disappear to publish their findings in some inaccessible periodical. They do not want colleges to impose the very remedies they feel failed to give practical preparation for their jobs in the first place (Trubowitz, 1986, p. 19).

When school people are listened to and given an opportunity to vent, the relationship evolves into stage 2, "lack of trust." This is passed through by sharing experiences and allowing roles to merge—e.g., high school teachers speaking at the college. Stage 3, the "period of truce," begins when trust is confirmed through continued mutual sharing. In stage 4, "mixed approval," school and college people begin to gain each other's approval and to feel enhanced by the other's presence. With stage 5 comes "acceptance." But stage 6 brings regression, as the vision of the collaborative may be blurred. Stage 7 follows with "renewal," through both continued dialogue and the inclusion of new people. Finally, stage 8 brings "continuing progress."

Unfortunately, perhaps because both Trubowitz, and Gifford and Gabelko, write from the university's perspective, their stages reflect on the emotions of those at the public school end of the collaborative. Thus, one has no sense of the changing feelings—resistance? suspicion? conversion? boredom?—that university faculty and administration experience in the course of a collaboration. The very goals of mutuality and collegiality, which the stages are intended to lead to, are belied by this one-sided focus.

Prestige

Most collaboratives begin with the common view of the university faculty and administration as missionaries and the public school teachers and administration as the deprived natives. The historical wisdom that the university holds all the resources, which it either gives—or fails to give—the public schools, has, not surprisingly, generated an arrogance on the university side and a passivity and resentment on the public school end. Even in the present period, funding for collaborative is often received and managed by the university.

The Coalition of Essential Schools, a practical result of Theodore Sizer's study of high schools, *Horace's Compromise*, is an alliance between Brown University and a number of diverse public schools in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The project was initiated by Brown, and the principles to which public school administrators must adhere in order to join were developed by Brown in accordance with Sizer's study. Because the coalition attempts to put previously established findings about school improvement into effect, Brown staff act as consultants and provide intellectual leadership. Funding for the project is through Brown University (Sizer, n.d.).

The Coalition for Essential Schools is perhaps a rarity in its clarity about the university's dominance; other recently established coalitions generally take a more egalitarian stance. Differences in prestige, resources, and confidence between public school and college members of collaboratives are discussed by a number of collaborative observers and participants—always with the conviction that the difference must be narrowed, if not obliterated (Gifford, 1986; Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988; Vivian, 1985a, 1985b). Nevertheless, if one looks at structural elements in most collaboratives, the elimination of prestige differences seems, at best, a matter of university members asking public school members for input (as in the case of SUPER, discussed above). The College Board's study of governance in school-university collaborations, for example, showed that this governance was either shared or the college dominated; there was no instance of school district dominance (P.Y. Bagasao, personal communication, 1988).

Networks of School-College Collaboratives

As the collaborative movement has grown, networks of school-university collaboratives have been created to share lessons, give mutual support, and develop models. The California Academic Partnership Program, for example, is a state-funded network of school-college collaborations whose purpose is specifically to increase minority access to college throughout the state. Networks of collaboratives can also used to create greater political impact. For example, one of John Goodlad's purposes in initiating the National Network for Educational Renewal was to generate a "critical mass" that could influence state policies (Goodlad, 1987). Networks can also include other partners in addition to colleges and public schools: the Triangle Coalition for Science and Technology education, for instance, is a network of local three-way alliances between colleges, public schools and business (Triangle Coalition, 1986).

Of the variety of collaborative networks four should be briefly described: The College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program for School-College Collaboration, the Council of Chief State School Officers' School/College Collaboration, the National Association of State University and Land-Grant College's (NASULGC) University/Urban School Collaborative Program, and the National Network for Educational Renewal.

The *College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program for School-College Collaboration* was initiated as part of its EQ Project and now includes 18 distinct local partnerships in different parts of the country. These 18 models share a focus on expanding and diversifying the pool of students who are academically well prepared to enter and succeed in higher education; they include approximately 125 schools or school systems and 60 two- and four-year private and public post-secondary institutions. Some models involve a single school district working with one college; others include several school districts and a number of two- and four-year colleges and universities. The activities of the individual partnerships comprise student outreach and support (including academic preparation and skills building), teacher professional development, curriculum improvement, parent and community outreach, and research (The College Board, 1987). The EQ Project has also sponsored several case studies of collaboratives in specific areas, including professional development, curriculum, and governance

(Adelman, 1988; Sosniak, 1988; Van de Water, 1988). The EQ project also intends to produce a critical work on the process of collaborative evaluation itself.

The Council of Chief State School Officers School/College Collaboration Project has been funded by the Mellon Foundation since 1983. Though directed to state education departments to generate collaborative activities between schools and colleges, the project focuses on school-college collaborations, and has gone through several funding phases. In 1983, 39 small grants were given to state education departments to plan collaborative activities. This phase was followed by larger grants to 14 states to implement collaborative projects. Most of these projects addressed teacher improvement, but there were also projects to increase communication between teachers, parents, and university educators; to create an integrated technical education to span high school and secondary education; and to facilitate the school/college transition of minority youth. The third phase of the Mellon project gave grants to 14 states for recruiting exceptional persons into teaching and for enhancing the current teaching force. Finally, in the most recent phase, awards have been made to 14 state education agencies to improve teaching in inner city and isolated rural schools where there are high concentrations of at-risk minority students (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1988).

With funding from the Ford Foundation, the *NASULGC University/Urban School Collaborative Program* was started in 1981 by the Division of Urban Affairs of the National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges. The program included 16 collaborations that focused on dropout prevention and reducing the transition problems of urban youth as they move out of high school, either into post-secondary education or into the workplace. While some sites had a narrow focus, others were eclectic and wide-ranging. Overall, projects included guarantees of job placement, college admissions, and scholarships, often linked to improved school performance (Martin, et al., 1986). The project was discontinued with the completion of Ford funding.

Initiated by John Goodlad in 1986, the *National Network for Educational Renewal* is a coalition of partnerships in 14 states involving 17 colleges and universities and 115 school districts. Whatever the difficulties of the local partnerships, the Network seeks to provide intellectual and political support for

influencing state policies through its task forces. The Network has addressed such central issues as teacher preparation, the common school curriculum, and providing equal access to knowledge for all children (Goodlad, 1987).

Conclusion

The problem of increasing the number of low-income minorities who enter and succeed in college lends itself to no single solution. However, school-college collaboratives have sprung up around the country during the 1980s as one possible solution, and they have spawned a wide variety of activities. Some of these focus on the students themselves, while others attempt to improve schooling in general, through enhanced teaching, better curriculum, and research methods.

Despite their proliferation, school-university collaborations remain more of an enthusiasm than a tested and lasting school improvement technique. In fact, there are a number of hazards associated with collaborations that require attention. As Gifford points out, "Time is always scarce, and collaborations require greater expenditures of time. Other outcome costs associated with collaboration include reductions in efficiency and possible creativity, truncation of some individual expectations, and the possibility of disappointment resulting from some collectively inflated expectations" (1986, p. 78). Despite commitments to equality among collaborative members, issues of leadership and control in the projects do not appear resolved; for the most part, university members seem to persist at the helm. Whether this is a problem, or not, remains to be seen.

It is also not yet clear how much students—and particularly poor, disadvantaged, minority students—benefit from these collaboratives. Interestingly, in a study of the beneficiaries of school-university collaborations, Mickelson et al. (1988) found that school personnel (teachers, principals, counselors, etc.) were perceived as having profited from collaboration to a much greater extent than had their university counterparts. Superintendents believed that professional school personnel also benefited more than pre-collegiate students, possibly because benefits usually accrue to students as a result of the efforts of school personnel. In fact, Mickelson et al. note that superintendents rank minority/disadvantaged/at-risk students eighth out of 12 in their list of the beneficiaries of the collaborations.

Clearly, this is an unfortunate shift for those collaboratives begun with the intention of helping such students.

While a variety of collaborative models are still being tried Mickelson et al. (1988, p. 68) conclude that, "most collaboratives have not yet reached the stage where the cooperating institutions can claim that they are trying to tackle some of the more serious problems facing education."

Further, Goodlad admits that, "There is little in the history of school-university relations to suggest that collaboration has served to solve tough, persistent problems. Often the relationship has been self-serving...Schools, for example, have sought university-based consultants to help them do better what they are already doing. Universities have sought out teachers in schools to supervise their student (1988, p.22). Yet for Goodlad, as well as for other enthusiasts of the current collaborative movement, these past failures can be attributed to a lack of true collaboration, to a sequential rather than simultaneous reciprocity, and to the failure of both parties to work with each other as equals. Perhaps it is in the service of equality that the future success or failure of school-university collaborations lies.

References

Adelman, N. (1988). *Collaborative professional development: A report on structures, facilitation, and outcomes of collaborative teacher professional development in the Educational EQuality Project's Models Program for School-College Collaboration.* Draft. New York: The College Board.

Boyer, E. (1982, January/February). A conversation with Ernest Boyer, *Changes.*

Boyer, E.L. (1985, September 2). The need for school-college collaboration. *Higher Education and National Affairs,* p.11.

Brizius, M., & Cooper, H. (1984, May). *A joining of hands: State policies and programs to improve high school-college linkages.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education, Inc.

Brown, P. (1983, April). *Cooperative activities between high schools and colleges.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Calahan, M., & Farris, E. (1986). *College level remediation.* Fast Response Survey System Report # 19. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 274 290

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1983). *High school: A report on secondary education in America.* New York: Author.

Carroll, C. (1987, June 9). Academic program encourages youngsters to plan for college. Stillwater, OK: *The Daily O'Collegian,* p.3.

City University of New York (CUNY). (1985, June). *Collaborative programs: Schools and colleges working together.* New York: Author.

The College Board, Office of Academic Affairs. (1987). *EQ models program for school-college collaboration.* New York: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1988). *School/college collaboration: Fact sheet.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Ehrenhalt, S. (1987, October). *Growth, competition, and labor force quality.* New York: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Farrar, E. (1988, July). *The Boston Compact: A teaching case.* New Brunswick: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Gaudiani, C.L., & Burnett, D.G. (1985/86). Academic alliances: A new approach to school/college collaboration. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Gifford, B.R. (1986, November). The evolution of the school-university partnership for educational renewal. *Education and Urban Society.* (*19*) 1, 77-106.

Gifford, B.R., & Gabelko, N.H. (1987, August). Research into research: SUPER project case studies. *Education and Urban Society.* (*19*) 4, 389-420.

Goodlad breaks ground for change. (1987, May 4). *Education USA*, p. 269ff.

Goodlad, J.I. (1988). School-University Partnerships for Educational Renewal: Rationale and Concepts. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad. *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases & concerns.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenberg, A.R. (1987). *College study in high school for low and moderate achievers.* Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Gross, T. (1988, June). A Valedictory: Together we build bridges to create a partnership in education. *SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership Newsletter.* (*4*) 3, 1ff.

Halcon, J.J. (1988). *Exemplary programs for college-bound minority students.* Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Hord, S.M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. *Educational Leadership.* (*43*) 5, 22-26.

Ishler, R.E., & Leslie, E.C. (1987, April). Bridging the gap between a public school system and a university. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 615-16.

Keating, P., & Oakes, J. (1988, August). *Access to knowledge: Breaking down school barriers to learning.* New York: The College Board; Denver: The Education Commission of the States.

Kenny, E., & Carlson, K. (1982, May). *High school to college transition: Planning issue paper no. 3.* Olympia: Washington State Council for Post Secondary Education. ED 230 133

Larkin, W. (1987, September 23). Models for collaboration. Presentation at the *College/university/pre-collegiate symposium*, sponsored by the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education and the Cleveland Public Schools, John Carroll University.

Lieberman, A. (1986, February). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on... *Educational Leadership.* (*43*) 5, 28-32.

Lieberman, J.E. (1985, December). Combining high school and college: La Guardia's Middle College High School. In W.T. Daly (Ed.). *College-school collaboration: Appraising the major approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 47-60.

Lund, L. (1988). *Beyond business/education partnerships: The business experience.* New York: The Conference Board.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Maeroff, G.I. (1983). *School and college: Partnerships in education.* Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation.

Martin, D.C., Mocker, D.W., & Brown, N.C. (1986). *Joining forces for urban youth: The NASULGC urban university/urban school collaborative program.* Final report. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges.

Mickelson, D.J., Kritek, W.J., Hedlund, R.D., & Kaufmann, A.M. (1988, February). *Urban school-university collaboration.* Final report to the Ford Foundation. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Graduate School of Education.

Mingle, J.R. (1987, June). *Focus on minorities: Trends in higher education, participation and success.* Denver: Education Commission of the States and State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

Mocker, D.W., Martin, D.C., & Brown, N.C. (1988, April). Lessons learned from collaboration. *Urban Education.* (*23*) 1, 42-50.

Parnell, D. (1985). *The neglected majority.* Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press. ED 262 843

Preer, J.L. (1981). AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1. *Minority access to higher education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Richardson, C., & Bender, Louis W. (1987). *Fostering minority access and achievement in higher education: The role of urban community colleges and universities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarasan, S. (1985). Two Cultures Meet: The Queens College—Louis Armstrong Middle School collaboration. In S. Trubowitz. *When a college works with a public school.* Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Sinclair, R.L., & Ghory, W.J. (1987). *Reaching marginal students: A primary concern for school renewal.* Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Goodlad, J.I. (1988). *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sizer, T.R. (n.d.) *The coalition of essential schools: 1984-1994.* Providence: Brown University Education Department.

Sosniak, L.A. (1988). *Partnerships with a purpose: A report on two programs for curriculum development and delivery, within the Educational EQuality Project's*

Models Program for School-College Collaboration. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

SUPER. (1988). *PACT: Promoting achievement through cooperative teaching: A SUPER research project.* Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education.

Triangle Coalition for Science and Technology Education. (1986). *How to form and operate a local alliance. A handbook for local action to improve science and technology education.* Washington, D.C.: National Science Teachers Association.

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the development of school-college collaboration. *Educational Leadership.* (*43*) 5, 18-21.

Trubowitz, S. (1984). *When a college works WITH a public school: A case study of school-college collaboration.* Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

University of California, Office of the President. (1987, November). *Report on university undergraduate student affirmative action programs, 1985-86.* Berkeley: Author.

Van de Water, G. (1988). *The governance of school-college collaboratives: Lessons learned from the College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program for School-College Collaboration.* Draft. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board.

Van Patten, J.J., & Dennison, D.A. (1987, June). *High school-community college collaboration.* ERIC Digest. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. ED 286 559

Vivian, J.R. (1986, November). Issues in establishing and developing an educational collaboration: The Yale-New Haven experience. *Education and Urban Society.* (*19*) 1, 59-76.

Vivian, J.R. (1985a). The concept of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute: The primacy of teachers. In *Teaching in America: The common ground.* A report of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. New York: The College Board.

Vivian, J.R. (1985b). Empowering teachers as colleagues: The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. In W.T. Daly (Ed.). *College-School Collaboration: Appraising the major approaches.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilbur, F.P., Lambert, L.M., & Young, M.J. (1987). *National Directory of school-college partnerships. Current Models and Priorities.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Wright, J. (1982, June). *1981-1983 Evaluation Report of The University of California School of Medicine Med-Cor Program: One of the Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other Non-Anglo (PHBAO) Programs.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District. ED 233 033

Clearinghouse on Urban Education

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027